



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/529,911

10/21/2005

Isao Watanabe

050156

5418

23850 7590 05/13/2008
KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP
1420 K Street, N.W.
Suite 400
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

HAUTH, GALEN H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

4111

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/13/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/529,911	Applicant(s) WATANABE ET AL.	
	Examiner GALEN HAUTH	Art Unit 4111	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group 1, claim(s) 1-10, drawn to an unheated curable binder composition.

Group 2, claim(s) 11-13, 15, 17, 19, 21-23, drawn to a method for forming an article with an unheated curable binder.

Group 3, claim(s) 14, 16, 18, 20, and 24, drawn to a product formed from an unheated curable binder.

2. The inventions listed as Groups 1, 2, and 3 do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The common technical feature of Groups 1, 2, and 3 is an unheated curable binder comprising a tri or tetra functional phenol with 1 or 2 electron donating groups on the benzene, a cross-linking agent, and a catalyst. This technical feature has been found to fail to provide contribution to the art as it does not define over the prior art *a posteriori* as evidenced by Ide et al. (JP 55045737). Due to a lack of a **special** common technical feature the three groups are subject to restriction. Group 1 pertains to the composition itself, while Group 2 pertains to the methods for using the composition in addition to a base material and Group 3 pertains to articles made by the processes in Group 2.

3. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species directed to a base material are as follows:

- a. Ceramics

- b. Carbon
- c. Natural Minerals
 - i. Sand
 - ii. Magnesia
- d. Glass
- e. Metal
- f. Wood Splinters
- g. Pulp Wood
- h. Waste Carbon
- i. Cloth Scraps
- j. Paper

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

4. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Art Unit: 4111

Species A)	13, 17-20
Species B)	13, 23-24
Species C)	13, 15-16, 21, 22
Species D)	13
Species E)	13
Species F)	13
Species G)	13
Species H)	13
Species I)	13
Species J)	13

The following claim(s) are generic: 11.

5. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The common technical feature of the species is an unheated curable binder comprising a tri or tetra functional phenol with 1 or 2 electron donating groups on the benzene, a cross-linking agent, and a catalyst. This technical feature has been found to not define over the prior art *a posteriori* as evidenced by Ide et al. (JP 55045737). Due to a lack of a **special** common technical feature the species are subject to restriction. .

6. This application contains claims directed to more than one sub-species of the species Natural Minerals. These sub-species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The sub-species directed to a Natural Mineral are as follows:

- i. Sand
- ii. Magnesia

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single sub-species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected sub-species, including any claims

subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional sub-species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected sub-species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

7. The claims are deemed to correspond to the sub-species listed above in the following manner:

Sub-Species i)	13, 15-16
Sub-Species ii)	13, 21-22

The following claim(s) are generic: 11.

8. The sub-species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the sub-species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The common technical feature of the sub-species is an unheated curable binder comprising a tri or tetra functional phenol with 1 or 2 electron donating groups on the benzene, a cross-linking agent, and a catalyst. This technical feature has been found to not define over the prior art *a posteriori* as evidenced by Ide et al. (JP 55045737). Due to a lack of a **special** common technical feature the sub-species are subject to restriction.

9. A telephone call was made to Donald Hanson on 05/01/2008 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

10. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

11. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement

Art Unit: 4111

is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GALEN HAUTH whose telephone number is (571)270-5516. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 7:30am-5:00pm ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sam Yao can be reached on (571)272-1224. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/GHH/

/Sam Chuan C. Yao/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4111